

My works involves expressing self-organizing processes and patterns through painting and drawing. These “self-organizing paintings” are not devices that emulate and copy nature, but rather create a nature within them. The central theme here is emergence, which in biology refers to the manifestation of phenomena in systems. Working through repeated and localized acts of production without a preconceived blueprint, the image of the whole appears as something that could not be foreseen from its parts. The results are living paintings that continue to grow and, at times, entirely metamorphose based on autonomous production systems that are akin to trees or seashell patterns, and which are peculiar to myself.

In order to conceive of emergence within the creative act, I rely on the theoretical references of self-organization, propounded since the 1960s, chaos theory, which makes use of computer simulations, and *autopoiesis*, which deals with the emergence and maintenance of cellular life. Composing a production system with the aid of such theories, allows for an expression akin to the process of life attaining increasing richness, which goes beyond the mere reiteration or cold geometry that academic painting tends to lapse into. The concept of emergence is equipped with a formal insight of a higher order, which allows painting to break free from the confinement of Formalism to achieve authentically post-modern painting.

I produce my paintings by formulating certain rules and performing them myself. What mediates these acts is the manual work accompanied by the mass of strings and paints. The support which grows by repeatedly branching out countless times, and the drawings painted over them, increasingly diversify as they etch the flow of change like in an organic evolution. Humanity has developed visual expression media from paintings as emulation, to photography as observation, and finally to simulation in which a computer constructed model is used to find correspondences in reality. The constructive approach in the fields of artificial life and robotics is a major example of “making to understand”. It is a method to create life-like behaviors heuristically by letting programs run on a computer.

Current research, as exemplified by studies of neural networks of artificial intelligence, is attempting to understand the workings of the human mind, but this does not suffice. This is because a program belongs to a different category than the subjective phenomenon of consciousness. This is why embodying the mind through a *poietic* act is still largely valid today. I use the knowledge of simulation to aid my painterly methods, but unlike deterministic computers, I focus on the very process in which new variables may emerge within the production system. In other words, the process in which the thingness of the material and the sensing of its *intensity* gently directs the system. For me painting is a visual device that sits between *poiesis* and simulation—a mandala of emergences that appears when the mind, affected by forms and shapes, reiterates and amasses acts.